

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-5, 8-17, 20, 21, 23-25, and 27-30 have been amended. For at least the reasons explained below, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections and pass the application on to issuance.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112:** The Examiner noted certain limitations recited in Claims 3, 4, and 15 recited antecedent basis or were unclear. Claims 3, 4, and 15 have been amended addressing the Examiner's concerns.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102:** The Examiner rejected Claims 1-30 under §102 as being anticipated by US Pub. 2002/0143933 to Hind. Hind is directed to a method in which an URL token is used to collect clickstream data from a number of related network exchanges (related requests and responses) between a client and a server. The clickstream data can be used to identify and analyze a user's navigation path through a website. See, e.g. Hind, Abstract and Summary.

Summarizing Hind, a client sends an HTTP request to a server. An HTTP response to the request is intercepted and any cookies in the header of the response are extracted and stored in a "cookie jar." All URLs embedded in the response are revised to include an "URL Token" that identifies the client, the server, the session, and the cookie jar in which the extracted cookies have been stored. See Hind, Para. [0042].

When that HTTP response is displayed at the client and a revised URL is "clicked," the subsequent resulting HTTP request includes a header containing the URL Token. That subsequent HTTP request is intercepted and the URL token is extracted. Using the URL token, the cookie jar is identified and the

cookies for that jar are inserted into the header of the request. The request is then forwarded on to its intended destination. See Hind, Para. [0043].

Hind describes maintaining a log of clickstream data entries. See Hind, Fig. 4. Each entry represents an instance in which data is extracted from or added to an HTTP request or an HTTP response. Each entry includes a date stamp, an URL token value, and a clickstream cookie. Related entries share related URL token values. By analyzing the date stamps and clickstream cookies of entries having related token values, a user's navigation path through a web site can be identified. See Hind, Para [0060].

**Claim 1** is directed to a method for coordinating sessions, and, as amended, recites the following acts:

1. providing, from a second server, a second session interface to a client, the second session interface having instructions to send second association data to a third server; and
2. communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server.

As summarized above, Hind teaches that the embedded URLs of an HTTP response in the form of a web page can be revised to include an URL token. That URL token is sent in the header of a subsequent request when one of the embedded URLs in the response web page is selected or otherwise requested. The URL token is then used to track a user's navigation through a web site.

Hind mentions nothing of communicating, from a second server, with a third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data as recited by Claim 1. Assuming (only for the sake of

argument) that Hind's response web page is returned from a second server to a client and contains an embedded URL referencing a third server where that URL has been revised to include an URL token, that second server never contacts the third server for any reason. More specifically, Hind's server responsible for sending a response web page which is subsequently embedded with a revised URL never communicates with another server referenced by the revised URL. Consequently, Hind's server responsible for sending a response web page embedded with a revised URL does not identify activity related to yet another web page provided to the client by yet another first server in the manner required by Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Claim, 1 is patentable over Hind as are Claims 2-4 which depend from Claim 1

**Claim 5** is directed to a method for coordinating sessions, and as amended recites the following acts:

1. providing, from a first server, a first session interface to a client, the first session interface having instructions to send first association data to a third server;
2. the client sending the first association data to the third server;
3. providing, from a second server, a second session interface to the client, the second session interface having instructions to send second association data to the third server;
4. the client sending the second association data to the third server; and
5. communicating, from the second server, with the third server utilizing the first and second association data to identify activity related to the first session interface.

As above with respect to claim 1, Hind does not teach or suggest communicating, from the second server, with the third server utilizing the first and second association data to identify activity related to the first session interface. For at least this reason, Claim 5 is patentable over Hind as are Claims 6-11 which depend from Claim 5.

**Claim 12** is directed to a session coordinating method and as amended recites the following acts:

1. providing from a first server a first web page to a client the first web page having instructions to request a web bug from a third server;
2. from the client, requesting the web bug sending a cookie and an URL for the first web page to the third server;
3. providing from a second server a second web page to a client, the second web page having instructions to request the web bug from the third server;
4. from the client, requesting the web bug sending the cookie and an URL for the second web page to the third server;
5. saving the cookie and the URL for the first web page as an entry in an association table maintained from the third server;
6. saving the cookie and the URL for the second web page as an entry in the association table;
7. from the second server, providing the URL for the second web page to the third server, querying the association table for the cookie in the entry containing the URL for the second web page;
8. from the second server, identifying other entries in the association table containing that cookie;
9. from the second server, identifying, from those entries, the entry containing the URL for the first web page; and
10. identifying activity relating to the first web page using that URL for the first web page.

As above with respect to Claims 1 and 5, Hind does not teach or suggest communication between the second and third servers in the manner required by Claim 12. More particularly, Hind does not teach or suggest providing, from the second server, the URL for the second web page to the third server to query the association table maintained by the third server for the cookie in the entry containing the URL for the second web page. Hind does not teach identifying, from the second, other entries in the association table containing that cookie. Furthermore, Hind does not teach identifying, from those entries, the entry containing the URL for the first web page.

For at least these reasons, Claim 12 is patentable over Hind.

**Claim 13** is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 13 and Claims 14-16 which depend from Claim 13.

**Claim 17** is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 5. For at least the same reason Claim 5 is patentable, so are Claim 17 and Claims 18-23 which depend from Claim 17.

**Claim 24** is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 12. For at least the same reason Claim 12 is patentable, so is Claim 24.

**Claim 25** is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 25 and Claim 26 which depends from Claim 25.

**Claim 27** is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 5. For at least the same reason Claim 5 is patentable, so are Claim 27 and Claim 28 which depends from Claim 27.


**Claim 29** is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 12. For at least the same reason Claim 12 is patentable, so is Claim 29.

**Claim 30** is directed to a system reciting means for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 30.

**CONCLUSION:** The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-30 are all felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gregory Eugene Perkins.

By



Jack H. McKinney  
Reg. No. 45,685

August 22, 2005